

**AB 599 Public Advisory Committee**

**Cal/EPA Building  
Conference Room 230  
Sacramento, California**

***Meeting Summary***

**Thursday, February 6, 2003**

**Convene Meeting**

The meeting began at 9:30 a.m. Members of the PAC, ITF, staff and the public introduced themselves.

**Review Agenda and Approve October 28/29, 2002 Meeting Summary**

Steve Ekstrom, PAC facilitator, described the agenda for the day, pointing out that the primary purpose was to respond to the latest draft report. This would be the last scheduled PAC meeting.

The meeting summary for December 19, 2002 was approved as mailed.

Lisa Babcock, State Water Board, informed the PAC that Sen. Machado has begun work on SB 21, which is intended to provide the framework for Proposition 50 fund allocations. The Senator plans to introduce legislation soon.

**Review and Discuss: Monitoring Program Report to the Legislature**

Before examining the draft report, the group was asked what their larger aim was for this meeting. After discussion, there was agreement that the PAC would ideally reach consensus on the final draft. The PAC also agreed to send a letter from the PAC Chair and Vice Chair to Art Baggett, Chair of the State Water Board, highlighting that the full PAC endorses the larger intent of the report, despite the fact that there may not be full agreement on every word.

The group then considered and agreed with the proposed approach for reviewing the report:

- Start with Chapter 4, followed by Chapters 5, 1, 2, and 3.
- Go through each chapter, section by section. Any amendment suggested by a member will be considered by the full group - consensus will be sought on each amendment as it's discussed.
- Concentrate on matters of significance, and won't spend time on grammar or formatting errors.

For the next several hours the PAC studied the latest version of the report. All specific language changes were approved by consensus. In some cases, specific language was left for staff to develop, with the PAC providing general direction. In addition to reviewing

the five chapters, the PAC also combed through the attachments making specific changes to enhance readability and clarity. At the conclusion of this exercise, the PAC agreed by consensus to accept the changes made at this meeting.

Next followed a discussion with staff about next steps. The PAC emphasized that it would like to see the revised report before it is delivered to SWRCB management. It was agreed that staff would revise the report, based on this meeting, and email it to PAC members. At this stage, members should supply very specific language if they wish to amend any part of the report.

Also, it was agreed that the accompanying PAC transmittal letter, from the Chair and Vice Chair, should be finalized and delivered by February 24. Bill Mills and David Beckman will send a draft of this letter to the PAC prior to sending it to Art Baggett.

**Discussion: Sources for Ongoing Program Funding (Proposition 50, Proposition 40, and other)**

The PAC was reminded that while it has recommended funding from Proposition 50 for a 10-year monitoring program, it has not addressed the issue of ongoing, stable funding beyond 10 years. The group felt that this was a very difficult assignment, given current funding uncertainties, and that it made more sense to think about a process for resolving funding for years 11 and beyond. It was suggested that further discussions about Year 11 funding be held in public forums. It was suggested that this be captured in the transmittal letter from the Chair and Vice Chair. Industry representatives expressed that they would not look favorably on an effort to get their sector to pay for the program. Their strong preference is that other sources be identified and tapped.

**Public Comment**

Members of the public had opportunities to participate in discussions throughout the course of the meeting.

**Evaluate Process and Adjourn**

PAC members were asked to evaluate the entire project, and to comment on whether the final product met their expectations from a year ago. Members' comments included:

- This project far exceeded my expectations.
- It looked so monumental at first; I'm glad to have my name associated with the final product.
- I came with self-interest; in the last 5 months we gelled as a group and spoke with one voice.
- We accomplished a lot - it appears we're ready to implement, as soon as we're authorized.
- Many thanks to our USGS consultants for advancing our knowledge and to the ITF and State Water Board staff for their hard work.

**Adjourn:** The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.